

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the claims is being requested. Claims 1-27 are in this application.

Regarding rejection under 35 USC 102(e) – Chin et al. (2004/0203565)

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Chin et al. (2004/0203565). First, the office action alleges that Chin discloses “receiving from a PSAP call center at least one tag identifier in response to the emergency call.” The Abstract, Fig. 1 and corresponding description were cited in support thereof. Applicant respectfully traverses. The Abstract, Fig. 1 and corresponding description in Chin do not disclose “receiving from a public service answering point call center at least one tag identifier in response to the emergency call from the at least one wireless unit.” (underline added for emphasis) The Abstract, Fig. 1 and corresponding description in Chin disclose that a called party number (CdPN=911), a calling party number (CgPN=ELRN) and a MSID1 are received by the PSAP, not received from the PSAP.

Second, the office action alleges that Chin discloses “transmitting to the PSAP call center a wireless call back number corresponding with the at least one tag identifier.” The Abstract, Fig. 2 and corresponding description were cited in support thereof. Applicant respectfully traverses. The Abstract, Fig. 2 and corresponding description in Chin do not disclose “transmitting to the public service answering point call center a wireless call back number.” (underline added for emphasis) The Abstract, Fig. 2 and corresponding description in Chin disclose that another calling party number (CdPN=ELRN) and MSID1 are transmitted from the PSAP, not transmitted to the PSAP.

Third, the office action alleges that Chin discloses “transmitting to the PSAP call center a wireless call back number...in response to receiving the at least one

tag identifier.” The Abstract, Fig. 2 and corresponding description were cited in support thereof. Applicant respectfully traverses. The Abstract, Fig. 2 and corresponding description in Chin do not disclose “transmitting to the PSAP call center a wireless call back number...in response to receiving the at least one tag identifier.” (underline added for emphasis) The Abstract, Fig. 2 and corresponding description in Chin disclose that the CdPN=ELRN and MSID1 are transmitted from the PSAP after the PSAP receives the CdPN=911, CgPN=ELRN and MSID1. Thus, the CdPN=911, CgPN=ELRN and MSID1 received by the PSAP cannot be in response to the CdPN=ELRN and MSID1 transmitted from the PSAP.

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, it is felt that claim 1 is patentable under 35 USC 102(e) over Chin.

Claims 2-5 depend upon, and include all the limitations of, claim 1. For the reason discussed with respect to claim 1, Chin does not disclose “receiving from a public service answering point call center at least one tag identifier in response to the emergency call from the at least one wireless unit” and “transmitting to the public service answering point call center a wireless call back number corresponding with the at least one tag identifier in response to receiving the at least one tag identifier.” Accordingly, it is felt that claims 2-5 are also patentable under 35 USC 102(e) over Chin.

Claims 8-9 were also rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Chin et al.. However, the office action fails to fully and clearly state the reasons for rejecting claims 8-9, as required by MPEP 707.07. The office action does not state with any specificity where Chin discloses each and every element of claims 8-9. Additionally, applicant does not believe that Chin discloses all the elements of claims 8-9. Accordingly, it is felt that claims 8-9 are patentable under 35 USC 102(e) over Chin.

Regarding rejection under 35 USC 102(e) – D'Evelyn et al. (2005/0053209)

Claims 14-20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by D'Evelyn et al. (2005/0053209). Specifically, the office action alleges that the D'Evelyn discloses "requesting the emergency callback corresponding with the entered at least one received tag identifier." Figs. 3-4 and paragraphs [0045]-[0094] were cited in support thereof. Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant reviewed the fifty cited paragraphs and Figs. 3-4 and have been unable to find any request for an "emergency callback corresponding with the entered at least one received tag identifier," as recited in claims 14 and 18. Accordingly, it is felt that claims 14 and 18 are patentable under 35 USC 102(e) over D'Evelyn.


Claims 15-17 and 19-20 depend upon, and include all the limitations of, claims 14 and 18, respectively. For the reason cited earlier, D'Evelyn does not disclose any request for an "emergency callback corresponding with the entered at least one received tag identifier." Accordingly, it is felt that claims 15-17 and 19-20 are patentable under 35 USC 102(e) over D'Evelyn.

Claims 1-13 and 21-27 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by D'Evelyn et al. However, the office action fails to fully and clearly state the reasons for rejecting claims 1-13 and 21-27, as required by MPEP 707.07. The office action does not state with any specificity where D'Evelyn discloses each and every element of claims 1-13 and 21-27. Additionally, applicant does not believe that D'Evelyn discloses all the elements of claims 1-13 and 21-27. Accordingly, it is felt that claims 1-13 and 21-27 are patentable under 35 USC 102(e) over D'Evelyn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all the claims presently in the application is respectfully requested, as is passage to issuance of the application. If the Examiner should feel that the application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would be useful, he is invited to contact applicant's attorney, Jimmy Goo, at (908) 582-7886.

Respectfully,
Douglas Rollender

By 
Stephen M. Gurey
Reg. No. 27366
(973) 386-8252

Date: September 1, 2006

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030